

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 23, 2006 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 and 42-83 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The claims have been rewritten anew, to better describe the invention. Some claims appear in different form, while others appear in the same or similar form.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 6 and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection has become moot. The objected-to claims have been canceled.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Meier (EP 0 681 192). The prior art rejection 103 is now moot. In the event it is maintained, it is respectfully traversed. There are significant differences between the Meier reference (EP 06 81 192 A2) and the presently claimed invention as defined in claims 84-129.

The Meier reference does not deal with interference. Instead, it is about switching filters so as to switch resonant frequencies, as between the different tasks of powering and communication. The rejection points to Meier's FIGURE 3 about a transponder receiving a CHARGE burst (powering), then an EOB, then a RECEIVE (communication). The powering CHARGE, however is not decoded for any information it might carry; nor does any selection take place, let alone a response to any such decoded information.

Claims 84-129 define subject matter which uses filters for preventing interference in the RFID tag field. A first wireless signal is decoded, and a selection takes place *responsive to what is decoded* (see, e.g., independent claims 84, 100 and 104). These are novel features over Meier. A novel feature is non-obvious under 103.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP



David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Dated: May 11, 2006

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040